Case 1:14-cv-03492-KPF Document 18 Filed 06/10/14 Page 1 of 7

E5tdwarc 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT INC., et al., 4 Plaintiffs, New York, N.Y. 5 14 Civ. 3492(KPF) V. 6 JOHN DOE 1 a/k/a WANG WEI 7 d/b/a DVDSEA.COM, et al., 8 Defendants. 9 10 May 29, 2014 10:10 a.m. 11 Before: 12 HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA, 13 District Judge 14 APPEARANCES 15 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP 16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs BY: LISA D. KEITH 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 THE CLERK: In the matter of Warner Bros. 2 Entertainment Incorporated, et al. against John Doe 1, et al. 3 Counsel, please identify yourself for the record. 4 MS. KEITH: Lisa Keith for the plaintiffs. 5 THE COURT: Good morning to you, Ms. Keith. Well, you are here alone today. 6 7 MS. KEITH: Yes. THE COURT: I don't mean that just in the sense that 8 9 you don't have any colleagues from your firm with you. I see 10 that none of the defendants in the case has made an appearance. 11 So let me ask you a couple of questions in that regard. 12 MS. KEITH: OK. 13 THE COURT: First of all, what efforts were made after 14 I signed the TRO order to serve the various defendants who are now listed as Exhibit A to your proposed preliminary injunction 15 order? 16 17 MS. KEITH: So the order provided, your Honor, that we 18 serve the defendants within five days of your order. So your order was signed on May 15th. On May 20th we served all of the 19 20 email addresses in Exhibit A via registered mail, using a 21 service called "rplst." 22 THE COURT: All right. I can tell you from this end 23 that we in chambers received no communications from any

Did your law firm or any of the plaintiffs in this

24

25

defendant.

case receive any communications from them?

MS. KEITH: No. We have received no communication.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. KEITH: I also served PayPal and PayPal would also have notified anyone whose accounts were restrained, and they give our Davis Wright Tremaine email address, and we didn't receive any emails on that email address either.

THE COURT: All right. I've reviewed several orders that you've given me for my consideration, and I'll talk about the longest one first and that is the proposed preliminary injunction order.

There are provisions in here regarding expedited discovery. Could you tell me, please, what discovery you were able to do during the pendency of the TRO?

MS. KEITH: So far, we've served PayPal and we are reviewing the PayPal records right now. And so further discovery that might happen in the future would be possibly if there are bank accounts identified through the PayPal records, serving those banks.

THE COURT: And I guess that that goes as well to my question of the ex parte asset restraint provision of your proposed order. Have there been assets identified for you or your clients to restrain?

MS. KEITH: Yes. The only asset so far that we have restrained are with PayPal, and it was how much -- it was

either 2 or \$3,000.

THE COURT: All right. You were able to seize control of the individual websites, is that correct?

MS. KEITH: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So to the best of your understanding, there is nothing in those web -- I'm sorry, there is no ability today to conduct the what you claim to be infringing conduct through these websites because they are under your control?

MS. KEITH: They are not under our control yet but they are disabled.

THE COURT: OK. Could you talk to me about the difference, please?

MS. KEITH: Yes. So normally what we do is we start out with the TRO and we disable the website. Then the preliminary injunction would continue that registry hold that is placed on the website, and that's done? At the registry level. So all eight of these websites were with the registry VeriSign. So right now VeriSign has them on I guess it is called a registry hold so that nobody can access them. Then later on in the case, if we move for a default judgment and permanent injunction, at that stage we would normally ask that the websites be transferred to our control, and then we would serve that order on VeriSign and put the websites into our account. And that would be when you could use the websites to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

put up a posting notice or whatever you might choose to do with them, but right now we don't control them; they are just down.

THE COURT: OK. And in this order you are still just seeking to keep them disabled, as opposed to moving control over to you?

> MS. KEITH: That is correct.

THE COURT: All right. Has any of the information from the PayPal accounts provided to you any additional evidence to support the claims of copyright infringement that you have articulated in your prior papers and in the current order?

MS. KEITH: Your Honor, there is nothing that goes to copyright infringement thus far, but the records do show that the addresses provided both in connection with the registration of the websites and in connection with the PayPal accounts seem to be fake addresses and that many of them originate from China.

THE COURT: OK. All right. Well, that is the state of affairs.

I can say, I have been given this proposed preliminary injunction order, and there are a lot of recitals that I will not repeat into the record. But I will note that on May 15th, in a prior proceeding, I was given a lot of documentation, particularly declarations from various representatives of the individual plaintiffs, demonstrating for me and explaining to

me how certain materials, in particular DVDs of movies and television shows, had been copied inappropriately and were being offered for sale on the websites that are listed in Exhibit A.

I do believe at this time that the plaintiffs have met the standards for the granting of a preliminary injunction, and those standards are outlined in this order. And for those reasons, and because there is nothing that has turned up since May 15th that tends to cast doubt on the evidence that I've looked at, which suggests that there is rampant copyright infringement, I will sign the proposed preliminary injunction order, and I will also sign the order that has been given to me and proposed to unseal the file in this case.

Ms. Keith, just a few thoughts.

At the close of this proceeding, I'd ask you, please, to order the transcript so that it will be available to me, and if and when a defendant would appear in this case, they will have knowledge of what has happened at this proceeding.

Secondly, it's my assumption that in time your law firm will pursue a default judgment in this case by obtaining certificates of default and then taking the next steps. Is that correct?

MS. KEITH: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. My individual rules of practice speak to this issue, and so I will simply await that

from your law firm. 1 2 MS. KEITH: Great. 3 THE COURT: Is there anything further you want to 4 address with me today? 5 MS. KEITH: Yes. I actually have -- so the order also 6 requires a seizure declaration to be filed within ten business 7 days of the order, which I think is tomorrow. So I have prepared that and I was going to file it tomorrow, but if you 8 9 would like, I could give that to you. And I also have an 10 affidavit of service from our paralegal. 11 THE COURT: OK. We'll take those since you have 12 brought them. 13 MS. KEITH: OK. 14 And is there anything else? THE COURT: 15 MS. KEITH: No. I also just wanted to let you know that we've secured the bond so I will get that on file. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. Great. 18 Thank you very much for coming in today. OK. 19 MS. KEITH: Thank you, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: And certainly if you hear from any of the 21 defendants, you will let us know. 22 MS. KEITH: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Thank you. OK. 24

25